REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 14-16, 18, 22-24, 31 and 32 have been amended, and Claims 6, 7 and 30 have been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I.   35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected Claims 18-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting Claim 18, the Examiner states that such claim is rejected as it is not limited to tangible embodiments. Applicants have amended Claim 18 to expressly recite a computer program product *tangibly* embodied in a *tangible* computer readable medium, as thus Claim 18 as amended is limited to tangible embodiments. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 18-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

II.   35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 30, the Examiner notes a typographical error with respect to the claim number dependency. As described below in the discussion of the 35 USC 103 rejection, this claim is being cancelled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

III.   35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 6-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Parker ("P-Synch"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, it is urged that the cited reference does not teach the claimed feature of "a user password profile in which the plurality of groups of resources are identified along with corresponding password information for each of the plurality of groups of resources". As can be seen, per Claim 1 there is a user password file that is used to identify multiple groups of resources along with corresponding password information. The cited reference has no concept of resource grouping, and instead provides an automated procedure such that each of a plurality of resources can be individually accessed to change a password from a single location (page 1, last paragraph; page 2, first full paragraph; page 2, last paragraph). While this reference also describes an HTML interface where users can specify

which machines/applications to change passwords for, including selecting 'all', such HTML interface does not teach or otherwise suggest the claimed user password profile in which *a plurality of groups of resources are identified* along with corresponding password information for each of the plurality of groups of resources. Thus, it is urged that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference as every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in a single reference.

Still further, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the features of originally filed Claims 6 and 7 (which are thus being cancelled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer) to further emphasize this resource-grouping distinction. In rejecting Claims 6 and 7 (whose features are now a part of amended Claim 1), the Examiner cites P-Synch's discussion of network-wide password management at page 2, and a network test on page 3 as teaching the all of the features of both Claim 6 and Claim 7. Applicants urge that this network-wide password management discussion describes using either a native API or TELNET to log in to each machine or application one-at-a-time, running whatever commands are necessary to modify the passwords. This passage also mentions that a user only specifies the password to change, and P-Synch runs through a list of targets in the background. This description of a list of targets does not teach (or otherwise suggest) a display that indicates *which of the resources may be grouped together based upon non-password security parameters associated with the resources*. Thus, it is further shown that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference as every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in a single reference.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 2-4 and 8-17 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-4 and 8-17 depend upon).

Further with respect to Claim 16, it is urged that the cited reference does not teach the claimed feature of "wherein the user password profile is distributed across the resources". As can be seen, the user password profile - in which the plurality of groups of resources are identified along with corresponding group password information for each of the plurality of groups of resources – is *distributed across the resources*. In rejecting Claim 16, the Examiner states that P-Synch teaches this claimed feature in that the cited reference teaches that the P-Synch program, which is alleged to require access to the user password profile, can run on a server, a client or on any machine on the network. Applicants urge two-fold error in such assertion. First, whatever profile may be used by P-Synch is not equivalent to the claimed user password profile of Claim 16, as the claimed user password profile is defined to be (per Claim 1) a *user password profile in which the plurality of groups of resources are identified along with corresponding group password information for each of the plurality of groups of resources*. The cited P-Synch reference does not teach such a user password profile (as more particularly detailed above with respect to Claim 1). Secondly, the fact that P-Synch 'requires access to a user password file' as alleged by the Examiner, and that P-Synch can run in one of a multitude of different locations (server, client, etc),

does not establish a teaching (or suggestion) that the user password profile *is itself* distributed across the resources, as required by Claim 16. This allegation only establishes that the P-Synch utility program can execute on one of a plurality of different machines. Therefore, it is further urged that Claim 16 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

With respect to Claim 18, such claim has been amended to include features originally recited in Claim 30. As amended, Claim 18 recites "first instructions for identifying a plurality of resources that are part of a group of resources, by retrieving a user password profile in which the plurality of groups of resources are identified along with corresponding group password information for each of the plurality of groups of resources, wherein each of the plurality of groups of resources is a group of resources which use the same password to authenticate a user's access to the resource". In rejecting Claim 30 (whose features are now a part of amended Claim 18), the Examiner states that the claimed password profile retrieval is taught by P-Synch at pages 2-3. Applicants urge that this network-wide password management discussion describes using either a native API or TELNET to log in to each machine or application one-at-a-time, running whatever commands are necessary to modify the passwords. This passage also mentions that a user only specifies the password to change, and P-Synch runs through a list of targets in the background. This description of a list of targets does not teach (or otherwise suggest) a user password profile in which *the plurality of groups of resources are identified along with corresponding group password information for each of the plurality of groups of resources*. Thus, it is shown that Claim 18 is not anticipated by the cited reference as every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in a single reference.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 19-30 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 18.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 23, in that the cited reference does not teach (i) instructions for providing a user with a listing of resources to which the user is given access; (ii) instructions for receiving selections from the user for grouping various ones of the resources into the plurality of groups of resources; and (iii) instructions for storing the plurality of groups of resources in the user password profile. In rejecting Claim 23, the Examiner cites P-Synch's description at pages 2-3 as teaching all of these claimed features. Applicants urge that this network-wide password management discussion describes using either a native API or TELNET to log in to each machine or application one-at-a-time, running whatever commands are necessary to modify the passwords. This passage also mentions that *a user only specifies the password to change*, and P-Synch runs through a list of targets in the background. This description of a list of targets does not teach (or otherwise suggest) any type of instructions for providing user-interaction for the actual grouping of resources, as per the features of Claim 23. Instead, it teaches at page 2, first full paragraph:

Page 9 of 11
Arbab et al. – 09/909,251

"You specify *only the password* to change to (or to reset to)" (emphasis added)

A user specifying only the password to change does not teach (or otherwise suggest) the specific claimed features of (i) instructions for providing a user with a listing of resources to which the user is given access; (ii) instructions for *receiving selections from the user for grouping various ones of the resources into the plurality of groups of resources*; and (iii) instructions for storing the plurality of groups of resources in the user password profile. Thus, it is further urged that Claim 23 is not anticipated by the cited reference as there are additional claimed features not taught by the cited reference.

With respect to Claim 31, it is urged that the cited reference does not teach the claimed feature of "means for providing a user with a listing of resources to which the user is given access, wherein providing the user with a listing of resources includes providing the user with a display that indicates which of the resources may be grouped together based upon non-password security parameters associated with the resources" for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 32, it is urged that the cited reference does not teach the claimed feature of "identifying a plurality of resources that may be grouped together according to non-password security parameters associated with the plurality of resources". As can be seen, there are security parameters associated with the plurality of resources, and these security resources – which are different from the first password and second password as they are separately recited in the claims - are used to *identify which of the resources may be grouped together*. The cited reference does not provide for resource grouping, and hence it follows that the cited reference does not describe any security parameters associated with the plurality of resources which are used to identify a plurality of resources that may be grouped together. It is therefore urged that Claim 32 is not anticipated by the cited reference as every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in a single reference.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

IV.   35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Parker as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Stallings ("Operating Systems – Internal and Design Principles"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claim 5 depends upon). Therefore, the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

V.   Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: July 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Brian D. Owens
Reg. No. 55,517
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorneys for Applicants